

REMARKS

The final Office Action of February 10, 2005, has been carefully reviewed, and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-16 remain pending. Claims 1 and 2 are amended. No new matter is added.

Interview Summary

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Craig for taking time to conduct a personal interview on March 30, 2005. During the interview, agreement was reached on many issues. It was agreed that the best mode rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is not valid and will be withdrawn by the Examiner.

Agreement was also reached that the claim language as it stood (prior to this Amendment) is not shown by the proposed combination of Sample and Barr, and that an updated search would be conducted by the Examiner. During the interview, Applicants' representative and the Examiner focused on claim 1 as an illustrative claim.

Agreement was further reached that the claim language would be amended to reflect a minor grammatical correction that in no way changes the current scopes of the claims. Claims 1 and 2 are therefore so amended by removing the word "substantially" and replacing the word "systems" with "components" in claim 1, and by replacing a semicolon with a comma in claim 2. As agreed, this amendment does not affect the scope of the claim.

Best Mode Rejection

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, due to an allegation in the Office Action that the best mode contemplated by the inventors has not been disclosed. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication during the interview that this rejection is withdrawn.

Art-Based Rejections

Claims 1-7 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,960,191 to Sample et al. ("Sample") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,297,181 to Barr et al. ("Barr"). Claims 8-10 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sample in view of Barr, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,659,716 to Selvidge et al. ("Selvidge").

Claim 1 recites that each bit in a framing sequence and a data packet is transmitted at a single level over two transmit clock periods. For example, referring to Applicants' specification at Fig. 2, each bit of data signal 202 is transmitted at either a high or low level for two clock periods of transmit clock 201. As discussed in the specification with regard to an illustrative embodiment consistent with claim 1, such a configuration may allow a receiver that samples the transmitted data to select an appropriate receive clock signal 203, 204, 205. Specification, p. 7, lns. 8-24.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication during the interview that the proposed combination of Sample in view of Barr does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Referring to Barr (which the Office Action relies on to show the above-mentioned claim feature), it is stated in the Background at col. 2, lns. 44-47 that in FM coding, a data '1' is represented by two channel transitions and a data '0' is represented by a single channel transition. Thus, in contrast to claim 1, the FM coding scheme in Barr uses at least two levels for each bit. Barr later refers to a separate digital audio interface protocol at col. 3, lns. 62-62, stating that 192 bits of data are transmitted as a group with 256 transmit clocks. This means that the digital audio interface protocol does not transmit a bit over two clock cycles as claimed. Thus, neither the FM coding scheme nor the digital audio interface protocol transmits each bit in a framing sequence and a data packet at a single level over two transmit clock periods, as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination of Sample and Barr. In addition, since neither Sample nor Barr alone teach or suggest the claimed feature, claim 1 is also allowable over each reference taken alone.

Independent claims 2, 5, and 11 are also allowable over Sample and Barr for at least similar reasons that claim 1 is allowable, and further in view of the differing recitations therein.

The dependent claims are also allowable over Sample and Barr by virtue of the allowability of their respective independent claims, and further in view of the additional features recited therein. Moreover, the addition of Selvidge does not cure the deficiencies of Sample and Barr.

Finally, Applicants maintain all arguments made in previous responses to office actions, such as those relating to a lack of proper motivation to combine Sample and Barr. Those arguments are incorporated by reference herein.

Conclusion

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notification of the same is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number below should he feel that an interview would expedite prosecution. Please charge any fees that may be due to our Account No. 19-0733.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

By: 

Jordan N. Bodner
Registration No. 42,338

Dated: March 31, 2005

1001 G Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001
Office: (202) 824-3000
Facsimile: (202) 824-3001